

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-64 and 66-70 were previously pending in the application. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 71 has been added. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 36 and 54 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims and new claim 71 are supported by the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by the instant amendments to the claims. Reconsideration of this application as amended which includes claims 3-64 and 66-71 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-10, 12-21, 31-35, 40-47, 58-66 and 70 as being obvious based on Maloney in view of Lauer. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

First, the Examiner notes that Maloney includes a container (cabinet 20 as shown in Fig. 2) to receive monetary objects, which once opened, cannot be reused to hold monetary objects. But reference to paragraphs 40 and 41 clearly shows that the Maloney container is far different from Applicants' invention. Specifically, the Maloney container is a cabinet formed from:

"a high strength security material such as steel or similar metal material to restrict or deter unauthorized access thereto."

The Maloney cabinet further includes

"a door or similar closure member that is hingedly mounted to one of the sidewalls and is moveable from an open position as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, to a closed position against the open front portion 26 of the cabinet to seal/enclose the chamber."

"A latch or lock mechanism 29 generally is mounted along the side wall 24' at the front of the cabinet in a position to engage and secure the door 28 in its closed position."

The cabinet door is locked and unlocked by an actuator "that causes a locking bolt or pin 32 (Fig. 2) to be extended or retracted into and out of engagement with a lock back 33...." (paragraph 41).

As is clear from the above description, the Maloney cabinet is basically a non-transportable, reusable safe with a lockable hinged door for providing repeated authorized access to the contents of the safe.

In contrast, Applicants' invention as defined in claim 71, comprises:

"a plastic, transportable and disposable container having a base and sidewalls defining an opening through which the monetary objects can be placed in the container" and a "closure member disposed over the opening so as to permanently seal the monetary objects within the container such that access to the monetary objects can be obtained only by creating a new opening."

Thus, contrary to Maloney, Applicants' invention provides a transportable container that, once closed, can only be opened by making a new opening in the container which destroys the container and makes quite apparent that there has been access to the contents of the container.

It is respectfully submitted that Lauer totally fails to cure the deficiencies of Maloney. Lauer is directed to a pouch for holding irrigating solution and a catheter in a contaminant-free environment between users. First of all, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney, which is directed to a high strength metallic safe with a lockable hinged door is in a totally different field from a pouch for holding a liquid and a catheter where sterility,

not protection from unauthorized access, is important. It is unrealistic and inappropriate to combine the features of such non-analogous act.

Second, the Lauer closure panel which is intended to maintain sterility, is in no way like the closure member of Applicants' container which "permanently seals" the contents of the container, such that access to the container contents "can be obtained only by creating a new opening in the container." Basically, it would be like replacing the high strength lockable security door of the Maloney safe with an envelope flap.

Based on the above, Applicants' respectfully submit that neither Maloney nor Lauer whether alone or in combination discloses Applicants' invention as recited in claim 71. Accordingly withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 based on Maloney as modified by Lauer in view of Meyer. But as discussed above, Maloney and Lauer are totally non-analogous art and any combination of their features is unrealistic and inappropriate. Based on the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that neither Maloney, Lauer, or Meyer, whether alone or in combination, discloses or suggests Applicants' invention as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-30, 48 and 54-57 based on Maloney as modified by Lauer in further view of Freeman. The same arguments presented above regarding the inapplicability of Maloney and Lauer apply here as well. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests Applicants' invention.

Based upon the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number

listed below.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commission is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 15-0665, Order No. 020305-004011.

Respectfully submitted,
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: February 26, 2009

By: /Joseph A. Calvaruso/
Joseph A. Calvaruso
Reg. No. 28,287

MAILING ADDRESS

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710